



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Reyister, a follower of General Reyes. Carranza was supported by young Madero, when he ran for Governor; so when Madero ran for President against Diaz, Carranza supported Madero. The net was then thrown out to catch him and he fled to the United States. He was a dominant factor in the Madero revolution and supported Madero to the end. He was the only man in all Mexico, when Madero was deposed, to stand against Huerta, even when the supposed pressure of the United States was directed to force him to sustain the murderer and usurper. With a handful of men he started his revolt against Huerta and persistently and stubbornly stuck to it, threw Huerta out, and, overcoming all opposition, was finally made President of Mexico. History is going to rank Carranza as one of the greatest men Mexico has produced, and a man who would be an honor to any country.

You may remember that Scott, in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, I believe, speaks of the Scot being much of a Spaniard. There is a strong Celtic strain in old Spain, and Carranza is Scotch when it comes to many of his personal characteristics. The typical Spaniard from parts of Spain is not the Latin as he is written about: he is the reserved and self-contained Scotsman, independent, stubborn and hard-headed, and honest, also proud no matter how poor. Perhaps the above will enable you to understand the man Carranza as he seems to many of his friends.

A grave injustice has been done Mexico, and in the past we have not been considered her friend. Mexico is entitled to our support and moral assistance, as well as financial. We owe her a debt which we can now pay, and all we need do is to show her that we only desire her welfare, and have no ulterior motive. We have the chance now to make Mexico our fast and true friend, and we certainly need this on the South. Then, if we take the purely commercial view, we can have the commercial trade of Mexico and all the benefits derived from this, without the responsibility of government, as so many interventionists advocated. And we can show that the United States is not the mercenary nation that Senator Beveridge would make us out—see his recent article in *Collier's Weekly*.

I bespeak for Mexico your friendly interest; be "simpatico," and you will find that the Mexican will promptly respond.

WILLARD L. SIMPSON.

Boerne, Texas.

CAN THE CHURCH BE BOTH BOUND AND FREE?

SIR,—I began the reading of Dr. McConnell's article in the REVIEW issue on "What Are the Churches to Do?" with keen interest. I laid it down with profound disappointment, even dismay. If this is the best answer that enlightened churchmanship can give, it is small wonder that honest men prefer to remain outside—and preserve their honesty.

Dr. McConnell's suggestion for renewing the life of the Church is simply that creeds be kept officially in force and privately ignored. This expedient is analogous to offering citizenship to aliens and permitting those who have conscientious scruples against our Constitution to treat it as though it were non-existent. To adapt Dr. McConnell's words to this analogy, we should permit our officials to say to such potential citizens: "We wish to declare formally, officially, and in a way which cannot be misunderstood by honorable men, that citizenship in this nation does not imply and is not understood to imply a subscription to a dogmatic Constitution." But that is just

what citizenship *does* imply, and must until the Constitution is repudiated: and membership in a credal Church means no less until the creed is repudiated. This method of snaring desirables will catch only the few who may be deluded by its specious appearance of liberality, but for the really honest man it can only supply the final *argumentum damnandum* of the traditional Church.

Dr. McConnell evidently recognizes that we are in a new world, but, like the majority in both orthodox and liberal Churches, he fails to perceive how complete is the gulf between the religious mode of the former world and that of the new. He seems to have deftly applied a coat of whitewash to the cardinal doctrines, but in spite of the endeavor to make them appear innocuous, it still remains true that the dogma of the incarnation and crucifixion are centrally important, and that the traditional Church stands or falls with their acceptance or rejection. Either there was a divinely ordered redemptive process through Hebrew history, culminating in the mission of Jesus, or there was not. The issue of the modern Church rests upon the view it takes of the validity of the scriptural authority which supports the Christian theory.

The Hebrew Christian of Paul's day believed himself under condemnation because of the Mosaic Law whose exactions he could not keep. Its authority was divine and therefore absolute. The nice question propounded to Paul was how a Jew could enjoy Christian liberty and obey the "oracles of God" at the same time. Paul cleared away the difficulty by what we must recognize as clever dialectic. He made the Law abrogate itself by what we know as a legal technicality.

The modern Churches with liberal leanings face the same quandary: how to be bound and free at the same time. Dialectic will not save the day this time. Nothing but simple honesty in facing the facts. The philosophy of history upon which Paul based his argument was the historic Messianic scheme upon which traditional Christianity has assumed its plan of redemption. Modern science and interpretation disavow it. The Churches must make their choice. They must continue to believe in the unalterable authority of the Bible, the special divine character of Hebrew history, the forensic Christ and the philosophical plan of salvation, or they must take the stand of enlightened criticism and wipe out their dogmatic theology based upon the assumptions of an untenable theory of Hebrew history. They must recognize that the greatness of the Hebrew lay, not in the fact of being specially chosen of God, but in the spiritual or ideal content of His experience. The essence of that experience is not in sacrifices and offerings, not even of a Christ, but in righteous acting, sincere living, and just and loving relations.

Jesus saw clearly the wide gap between the Messianic plan of Judaism and the essential teaching of the Hebrew prophets. He deliberately refused to set forth his message in the traditional language of His people. His parables are His way of discarding the time-worn phraseology of traditionalism and presenting the essential truth of religion in His own new and personal way. The Church of the present must have the genius to do the same thing, or it is as good as dead.

A new religion is shaping itself in our time, just as surely as Christianity sprang out of the Roman world of two thousand years ago. It has sprung out of the loins of humanity. It is the child of the time, and will have power to renew the life of the world. It concerns itself not at all with old beliefs,

but directly with the needs of men. Its speech is the familiar speech of daily intercourse. Not having the smack of conventional piety, the traditional Churches are deaf to its meaning. But the familiar speech of every day is the soul's true vernacular. What the Churches are trying to hold onto is stale rhetoric and dead symbols, mummy-cases of the unverified assumptions of an old world that has dropped into chaos. The religion of today and tomorrow will sometime, perhaps suddenly, organize itself as the noblest institutional expression of the community and its ideals. Its forms and services will grow by a natural evolution out of enlightened effort to meet the needs of men.

Dr. McConnell's statement that the liberal Churches have generally failed is premature. The present age is permeated by the spirit of liberal ideals. Dr. McConnell himself has not entirely escaped the contagion. Modern liberalism is still young, and the rapidly growing democracy of all human institutions decrees that the religion of democracy must be a free religion. That freedom cannot be a pretense. It must be founded on a genuine respect for honest convictions, for verified truth and the recognition of progress.

Sincere and honest men of this new age will be drawn into sympathetic and active relation with the institution of religion whenever it is seen to be an intelligent expression of the ideals of this age.

(REV.) CHARLES PEASE,
Minister Unitarian Church.

SACRAMENTO, CAL.

FOR RELIEF OF TENSION

SIR,—Give us agriculturalists good measure of such articles as "The Editor with the Hoe" and "Between Us Liars"—just to relieve the war tension. It's bound to be a long pull before we sight shore!

About all that makes existence tolerable in these times is the memory of the past and the hope of the future. Amid the abiding memories are Mark Twain, and Marse Henry; and the present writer is willing to survive so long as George Harvey can dictate editorial matter while scrubbing the stoop—beg pardon, piazza—and watching his pet cavort. May one who never voted the Republican ticket, but has lived to see Bryan barred out, and Roosevelt retired, and Pennsylvania Avenue crowded with triumphant, satisfied, ultra-patriotic ex-Confederate soldiers in uniform, marching with their colors, rise to remark: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform"; Russia knows it now; Great Britain is finding it out; may not America find herself as never before?—realizing the prophecy of Bishop Berkeley: "Westward the course of empire takes its way; the first four acts already past, a fifth shall close the drama with the day; Time's noblest offspring is its last." Yes, we have something to hope and live for, thanks to Woodrow Wilson! God bless and preserve him!

CHESTNUT HILL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

A. WARREN KELSEY.